

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE 10/764,332 01/23/2004 Lawrence P. LaFalce KBROP0100USA 5770 **EXAMINER** 7590 09/27/2004 Cynthia S. Murphy GRAHAM, MARK S Renner, Otto, Boisselle & Sklar, LLP ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER Nineteenth Floor 1621 Euclid Avenue 3711 Cleveland, OH 44115-2191

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/764,332	LAFALCE, LAWRENCE P.	. <
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark S. Graham	3711	
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio  - If the period for reply secified above, the maximum statutory p  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may on. , a reply within the statutory minimum of t period will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mistatute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed  hirty (30) days will be considered timely.  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un	•	• •	
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application Papers  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wite 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and application Papers	hdrawn from consideration.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		o by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	o the drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ne Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have bee ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date	8) Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dumas.

As disclosed by Dumas in Fig. 7 a golf course may be set up in the manner claimed in claims 1-18 and 21. The areas of the course not being played or the areas between fairways may be considered the central non-course region.

Concerning claims 7-9 as can be seen in Fig. 1 of Dumas tee areas may be aligned in all radial directions relative to the greens.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumas in view of Kokai. Dumas locates a clubhouse at an edge of the course. However, such may also be centrally located as disclosed by Kokai. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to so locate Dumas' clubhouse if it was desired to provide a more central location on the golf course.

Morris, Chaslot, Purdy, Terry, Futterer, Hill, and Renn have been cited for interest because they disclose similar courses.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,332 Page 3

Art Unit: 3711

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark S. Graham at telephone number 703-308-1355.

MSG 9/17/04

NExaminer NExaminer